

Appl. No. 10/036,116
Amdt. dated August 8, 2005
Reply to final Office action of June 8, 2005

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicants have received the final Office Action dated June 8, 2005, in which the Examiner: 1) rejected claims 1 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention is allegedly directed to non-statutory subject matter; 2) rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly anticipated by *Sharangpani et al.* (U.S. Pat. No. 5,357,455); 3) objected to claim 3 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim; and 4) indicated that claims 2, 4-16, and 18-32 are in a condition for allowance.

Applicants appreciate the allowance of claims 2-16 and 18-32. With this Response, Applicants have amended claims 3 and 17 and canceled claim 1.

Applicants have canceled claim 1 in an effort to expedite issuance of the instant application. This cancellation should not be construed as concession by Applicants as to the correctness of the Examiner's rejections of claim 1, or as a relinquishment of Applicant's right to pursue claim 1 in a continuation application.

Claim 3 has been rewritten in independent form and Applicants respectfully submit that claim 3 is in a condition for allowance.

Claim 17 has been amended to recite that the method of operating a cell of a floating point division algorithm is executed in a microprocessor. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 17 is directed to statutory subject matter, and respectfully request reconsideration.

In the course of the foregoing discussions, Applicants may have at times referred to claim elements in shorthand fashion, or may have focused on a particular claim element. This discussion should not be interpreted to mean that the other elements can be ignored or dismissed. The claims must be viewed as a whole, and each element of the claims must be considered when determining the patentability of the claims.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. It is believed that no extensions of time or fees are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Appl. No. 10/036,116
Amdt. dated August 8, 2005
Reply to final Office action of June 8, 2005

hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a), and any fees required (including fees for net addition of claims) are hereby authorized to be charged to Hewlett-Packard Development Company's Deposit Account No. 08-2025.

Respectfully submitted,



Jonathan M. Harris
PTO Reg. No. 44,144
CONLEY ROSE, P.C.
(713) 238-8000 (Phone)
(713) 238-8008 (Fax)
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
Legal Dept., M/S 35
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

BEST AVAILABLE COPY